UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,518	11/25/2003	Koji Yamaya	17280	5316
	7590 08/29/200 TT MURPHY & PRES	·	EXAM	INER
400 GARDEN		, -	KASZTEJNA, MATTHEW JOHN	
SUITE 300 GARDEN CIT	Y, NY 11530		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/721,518	YAMAYA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
	* .	Matthew J. Kasztejna	3739			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apor Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING INTO THE MAILING THE MAILING THE MAILING THE MAILING THE MAILING THE MAILING THE MAIL	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to divide apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed  m the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02</u>	<u>August 2007</u> .				
2a)[	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.	•			
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims		•			
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5-7,9 and 10</u> is/are pending in the application.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.				
5)[	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>5-7,9 and 10</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	•			
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
10)🖂	The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is		·			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		, ,			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached Offic	e Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).			
a)	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer	•	tion No.			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri					
	application from the International Burea	<u>*</u>	· ·			
* (	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not receiv	red.			
Attachmer	it(s)		•			
_	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar				
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail [ 5) Notice of Informal				
. —	rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	· ·			

Application/Control Number: 10/721,518

Art Unit: 3739

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Notice of Amendment

In response to the amendment filed on August 2, 2007, amended claims 5, 7 and 9; canceled claims 1-4 and 8; and new claim 10 are acknowledged. The finality of the previous office action mailed March 26, 2007 is withdrawn. The following new grounds of rejection are set forth.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 9 recites the limitation "the edge surface". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,518

Art Unit: 3739

Claims 5-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,352,503 to Matsui et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163029 to Sonnenschein et al.

In regards to claims 7 and 9-10, Matsui et al. disclose an endoscope apparatus 101 comprising: an insertion portion 102 having first 141 and second 143 channels arranged therein and terminating at first and second openings, respectively, at a distal portion of the insertion portion; an observation optical system which is arranged to the insertion portion (see Col. 11, Lines 57-59); a first treatment-tool oscillating base which guides, in a first direction, a first treatment-tool 145 guided via the first channel 141 arranged to the insertion portion, the first treatment-tool oscillating base being provided so as to be rotatable in the first opening corresponding to the first channel at a projection side of the first treatment tool; and a second treatment-tool oscillating base which guides, in a second direction, a second treatment-tool 147 guided via the second channel arranged in the insertion portion, the second treatment-tool oscillating base being provided so as to be rotatable in the second opening corresponding to the second channel at a projection side of the second treatment tool; wherein the end of at least one of the first and second treatment-tools guided by the first and second treatment-tool oscillating bases is guided to the outside of a field of view from the inside of an endoscope image based on an optical image obtained by the observation optical system (see Fig. 29 and Col. 14, Lines 10-67). Matsui et al. are silent with respect to a screen size in the guiding direction of the treatment tool guided to the outside of the field of view from the inside is set to have a shorter side, or to be shorter, as compared with

Art Unit: 3739

a screen size in the guiding direction of the treatment tool guided within the inside range of the field of view. Sonnenschein et al. teach of an analogous endoscopic apparatus wherein the field of view for the topical channel may bat be non-circular, such as square, rectangular, cylindrical, toroidal section or any other shape. The views may take on any shape and do not need to be of equal size (see Fig. 3c and paragraph 0075). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to vary the field of view with respect to the treatment tools of Matsui et al. to provide adequate visualization and alternate view fields of the tools used with the endoscope as taught by Sonnenschein et al.

In regards to claims 5-6, Matsui et al. disclose an endoscope apparatus, wherein the edge of the first treatment-tool is guided to the outside of the field of view from the inside, toward substantially a vertical direction of a screen of the endoscope image, and the edge of the second treatment-tool is guided within the field of view, toward substantially a horizontal direction of the screen of the endoscope image and wherein the outside of the field of view is one in the top direction of the screen of the endoscope image (see Figs 1, 12 and 29 and Col. 14, Lines 10-67).

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5-7 and 9-10 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Art Unit: 3739

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Kasztejna whose telephone number is (571) 272-6086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C.M. Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJK MA

8/23/07

LINDA Ć. M. DVORAK SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER GROUP 3700